



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,402	03/01/2004	David M. Hilbert	FXPL-01090US0 IP-03-003B	1447
23910	7590	04/05/2007	EXAMINER	
FLIESLER MEYER LLP 650 CALIFORNIA STREET 14TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108			ROSE, HELENE ROBERTA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2163	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	04/05/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/790,402	HILBERT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Helene Rose	2163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 01 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

1. In response to communication entered on 1/4/2007. Claims 18 and 24 have been amended. No claims were cancelled or added. Therefore, Claims 1-62 is pending.

2. Applicant's arguments, see applicant remarks on page 17, paragraph VI, entered on 1/4/2007, with respect to claims 1-62, have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 1-62 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C – 112

3. In view of Claims 18 and 24 being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, in which claims 18 and 24, recited the limitation "a hyperlink which is difficult to reproduce", which rendered the claim indefinite because neither the claim nor the specification explains what "a hyperlink which is difficult to reproduce" means.

Examiner withdraws the pending rejection based on applicant's amendment to claims 18 and 24.

Double Patenting

4. Independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 23, 29, 35, 47, and 61-62 (and its dependencies where applicable) of this application conflict with Independent claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 26, and 32 (and its dependencies where applicable) of Application No. 10/777,289; 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. Applicant

Art Unit: 2163

is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 6-9, 14-19, 23-24, 28-29, 35, 41, 43, 47, 50, 52-54, and 60-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hilbert et al (US Publication No. 2003/0088570, Date of Publication: May 8, 2003, hereinafter Hilbert).

Claims 1 and 9:

Regarding Claims 1 and 9, disclose a method and a computer program product utilizing the same functionalities, wherein Hilbert teaches method and a computer program product, stored on a computer readable medium, and including computer executable instructions for controlling a processor to manage access to remote files, the instructions comprising:

receiving an identifier (paragraph [0063], “inputting an identity of an user into a device portal of the multi-user document device”, which is equivalent to “receiving an identifier”, Hilbert);

determining a remote file source associated with the identifier (paragraph [0033], wherein using the user identification device to verify the user of a m multi-user document device and

Art Unit: 2163

accessing a personal portal associated with the user based on the verified identity of the user and paragraph [0102], wherein the username, password, and/or profile is used to access a database of personal resources, which is equivalent to ‘determining a remote file source associated with an identifier’, Hilbert);

generating a list of recent files associated with the identifier (paragraph [0102], wherein access a database of personal resources such as recent document files and email, Hilbert), the list generated from multiple locations storing files (paragraph [0102], wherein the database of personal resources may be on a multi-user document device or on an ID device for a stand alone multi-user document device and may be on the multi-user document device, wherein the ID device or the network for a networked multi-user document device, which is interpreted to be equivalent to “generating a list of recent files associated with the identifier the list generated from multiple locations storing files”, Hilbert); and

presenting an interface enabling access to the list of recent files from a remote client (paragraph [0105], respectively, Hilbert);

Claims 6 and 14:

Regarding Claims 6 and 14, Hilbert teaches wherein generating the list of at least one recently accessed file comprises receiving a list of at least one recently accessed file on the file source (paragraph [0102], wherein this reads over ‘access of personal resources, such as recent document files’, Hilbert).

Claims 7 and 15:

Regarding Claims 7 and 15, Hilbert teaches wherein generating the list of at least one recently accessed file comprises:

reading a time of last access for files stored on the file source (paragraph [0102], wherein access a database of personal resources, such as recent document files, reads over “reading a time of last access for files stored on the file source”, Hilbert); and

selecting a file according to its time of last access (paragraph [0103], wherein a determination is made whether or not the user has selected a file, which reads over “selecting a file according to its last access”, Hilbert).

Claims 8 and 16:

Regarding Claims 8 and 16, Hilbert discloses wherein generating the list of at least one recently accessed file comprises:

determining an application available to the user (paragraph [0102], wherein “the username, password, and/or file is used to access a database or personal resources such as recent document files and email”, which reads over “determining an application available to the user” Hilbert);

receiving from the file source a list of at least one file associated with the application (See Figure 7; and paragraph [0079], wherein “the personal resources accessible via the personal portal may include previous interaction history, such as facsimile call logs, which reads over “receiving from the file source a list of at least one file associated with the application”, Hilbert).

Claims 17:

Regarding claim 17, Hilbert teaches a method and a computer program product for transmitting electronic mail messages, the method comprising:

generating an electronic mail message interface (paragraph [0081], wherein personal portal may enable a unique interface for messaging such as e-mail message communication,

wherein documents that are accessed at different multi-user document device may be shared between different users via their own personal portals, wherein the personal portal may include icons representing individuals that are associated with contact information such as email address and paragraph, which is equivalent to “generating an electronic mail message interface”, Hilbert);

configuring the electronic mail message interface for a remote client (paragraph [0087], wherein he custom-developed software may use existing APIs, such as, for example, the Microsoft Windows API, to access the user's documents and to generate appropriate thumbnails and icons, and other existing APIs, such as, for example, the Microsoft Outlook API, to access the user's address book and email, which is equivalent to “configuring the electronic mail message interface for a remote client”, Hilbert);

accepting a message including a file location from the remote client (paragraphs [0102] and [0103], wherein the user name and password and or profile is used to access a database of personal resources such as recent document files and email, and wherein the database of personal resources may be on the multi-user document device or on an ID device for a standalone multi-user document device and may be on the multi-document device and so forth, and wherein the user may operate the multi-user document device via the personal portal using the personal resources and wherein a user input is processed and determination is made whether or not the user has selected a file and so on, which is equivalent to “accepting a message including a file location from the remote client”, Hilbert);

moving a file from the file location to a shared location (paragraph [0081], respectively, which is equivalent to “moving a files from the file location to a shared location”, Hilbert); and

inserting in the message a hyperlink associated with the shared location (paragraphs [0078], [0079], [0080], and [0081], wherein personal resources may include website addresses, including history and/or bookmarked web pages and so forth, and wherein personal portal may include access to various information resources provided by the device portal, and wherein the personal portal enable a unique interface for messaging such as email communication, and documents are accessed at the multi-user document device may be shared between different users via their own personal portals, which is equivalent to “inserting in the message a hyperlink associated with the shared location”, Hilbert).

Claims 18 and 24:

Regarding Claims 18 and 24, Hilbert teaches wherein inserting the hyperlink in the message **further includes adding a security token to the message in order to ensure that only a recipient of said message can access the file in said shared location** (paragraph [0071], wherein the personal resources 400 may include various informational resources such as facsimile call logs 410, recent documents 412, user preferences for the multi-user document device 414, website addresses 416 and e-mail 418 and the personal resources 400 provide information based on the identity of the user of the multi-user document device so that only the identified user has access to the personal resources 400, wherein the personal portal 500 is secure against unauthorized use and unauthorized access to the personal resources 400; and paragraph [0074], respectively, Hilbert).

Claim 22:

Regarding Claim 22, Hilbert teaches transmitting the message to a remote recipient (REFER to [0081] respectively, Hilbert).

Claim 23:

Regarding Claim 23, Hilbert teaches a computer program product, stored on a computer readable medium, and including computer executable instructions for controlling a processor to transmit electronic mail messages, the instructions comprising:

generating an electronic mail message interface (REFER to claim 17, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Hilbert);

configuring the electronic mail message interface for a remote client (REFER to claim 17, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Hilbert);

accepting a message from the remote client, the message including a file location by a file (REFER to claim 17, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Hilbert); and

inserting in the message a hyperlink associated with the file (REFER to claim 17, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Hilbert).

Claim 28:

Regarding Claim 28, Hilbert teaches wherein the hyperlink is associated with the file location (Figure 19, diagrams S8310 and S8320, wherein a thumbnail is interpreted to be the

hyperlink, in which a thumbnail is defined to be a miniature version of an image or electronic document version of a page that is generally used to allow quick browsing through multiple images or pages, wherein for instance a web page often contain thumbnails of images, Hilbert).

Claim 29:

Regarding Claim 29, Hilbert teaches a system for managing access to remote files, the system comprising:

a client interface configured to:

configure an interface for a remote client (REFER to claim 17, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Hilbert); and

receive an identifier from the remote client (paragraph [0063], wherein inputting an identity of a user into a device portal of the multi-user document device, Hilbert); and

a file selection generator configured to:

contact at least one file source associated with the identifier (paragraph [0079], wherein the personal portal may include access to the various information resources provided by the device portal as well as personal resources such as documents/desktops resources, email and other information, and wherein this is interpreted to be equivalent to “contact at least one file source associated with the identifier, Hilbert); and

generate a list of at least one recently accessed file from the file source (REFER to claims 1 and 9, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Hilbert).

Claim 35:

Regarding Claim 35, Hilbert teaches a method for managing access to files from a remote client, the method comprising:

receiving an identifier (REFER to claims 1 and 9, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Hilbert);

determining a list of shared files associated with the identifier (paragraph [0016] and [0081], respectively, Hilbert);

determining a list of files on a file source associated with the identifier (REFER to claims 1 and 9, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Hilbert);

generating a unified list of files from the list of shared files and the list of files on the file source (REFER to claims 1 and 9, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Hilbert); and

presenting an interface enabling access to the unified list from a remote client (REFER to claims 1 and 9, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Hilbert).

Claim 41:

Regarding Claim 41, Hilbert teaches wherein the service is a print service configured to print the file at a remote printer (paragraph [0106], wherein whether or not the user has selected a print function of the multi-user document device, and if so, continues to step S8350, where a personal print interface is generated, Hilbert).

Claim 43:

Regarding Claim 43, Hilbert teaches wherein the interface is configured to accept requests from the remote client configured for a multifunction device portal and the service is a service provided by the multifunction device (Figures 16, 18, and 19, respectively, wherein these figures reads on “the interface is configured to accept requests from the remote client configured for a multifunction device portal and the service is a service provided by the multifunction device, Hilbert).

Claim 47:

Regarding Claim 47, Hilbert teaches a computer program product, stored on a computer readable medium, and including computer executable instructions for controlling a processor to manage access to remote files, the instructions comprising:

receiving an identifier (REFER to claims 1 and 9, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Hilbert);

generating a list of recent files associated with the identifier, the list generated from multiple locations storing files (paragraph [0051], [0052], and [0069], respectively, Hilbert);

presenting an interface enabling access to the list of recent files from a remote client (See Figures 9-12, respectively, Hilbert); and

accepting an action request for a file in the list (Figure 20, diagrams S8354 and S8355 and wherein its further defined in paragraph [0109] wherein user input is processed and a determination is made whether or not the user has selected a print function of the multi-user document device and if so the selected file is printed, which is interpreted to be equivalent to

“accepting an action request for file in the list”, Hilbert).

Claim 50:

Regarding Claim 50, Hilbert teaches wherein the action request comprises a request to fax the file to a remote user (Figure 16, diagrams S600 and S610, Hilbert).

Claim 52:

Regarding Claim 52, Hilbert teaches accepting a file generated by a multifunction device (Figure 23, all features, Hilbert); and

adding the file generated by the multifunction device to the list of recent files (Figure 22, diagram S8760 and Figure 23, all features, Hilbert).

Claim 53:

Regarding Claim 53, Hilbert teaches wherein the action request comprises printing the file on a remote printer (paragraph [0106], wherein whether or not the user has selected a print function of the multi-user document device, and if so, continues to step S8350, where a personal print interface is generated, Hilbert).

Claim 54:

Regarding Claim 54, Hilbert teaches wherein the action request comprises emailing a message containing a reference to the file (Figure 19, diagrams S8360 and S8370, Hilbert).

Claim 60:

Regarding Claim 60, Hilbert teaches wherein the remote client is a multifunction device (See abstract, Hilbert).

Claims 61 and 62:

Regarding Claims 61 and 62, Hilbert teaches a computer program product, stored on a computer readable medium, and including computer executable instructions for controlling a processor to transmit mail messages, the instructions comprising:

generating an electronic mail message interface (REFER to claim 17, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Hilbert);

configuring the electronic message interface for a remote client (REFER to claim 17, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Hilbert);

accepting a message from the remote client, the message including a file location for a file (REFER to claim 17, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Hilbert); and

inserting in the message an executable, the executable configured to enable access to the file (REFER to claim 17, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Hilbert).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2-5, 10-13, 19-21, 25-27, 30-34, 36-40, 42, 44-46, 48-49, 51, and 55-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Zhang (US Patent No. 6,016,478, Date of Patent: January 18, 2000, hereinafter Zhang) in view of Godlin et al. (US Publication No. 20020161860, Pub date: Oct. 31, 2002, hereinafter Godlin) and further in view of Lamming et al. (US Patent No. 6, 144, 997, Date of Patent: Nov. 7, 2000, hereinafter Lamming).

Claims 2 and 10:

Regarding Claims 2 and 10, Zhang teaches wherein configuring the interface for the viewing capacity of the client device (column 16, lines 48-56, wherein the user can view and print the schedule of any resource that her or she manages and wherein to view a resource schedule the user chooses Internet|Resources|View and in response the system displays viewing resources from a pull-down list, the user select a particular resource to view and then click to print the schedule for the resources in weekly or monthly view, which is interpreted to be equivalent to “configuring the interface for the viewing capacity of the client device”, which corresponds to applicant specification in paragraph [0026], wherein any device having a file view capacity, Zhang).

Claims 3 and 11:

Regarding Claims 3 and 11, Zhang discloses the limitation above. However, Zhang does not disclose wherein the client device is a laptop.

On the other hand, Godlin teaches wherein the client device is a laptop computer (paragraph [0005], wherein mobile notebooks which is equivalent to laptop computer, Godlin).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a mobile device discloses by Godlin within Zhang system for the purpose of collaboration, flexibility, and compactness of the device.

Claims 4 and 12:

Regarding Claims 4 and 12, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin teaches wherein the client device is a personal data assistant (paragraph [0056], Godlin).

Claims 5 and 13:

Regarding Claims 5 and 13, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin teaches wherein the client device is a cellular telephone (paragraph [0005], Godlin).

Claims 19:

Regarding Claim 19, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin teaches wherein the remote client is a laptop computer (paragraph [0005], wherein mobile notebooks, Godlin).

Claims 20 and 26:

Regarding Claims 20 and 26, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin teaches wherein the remote client is a personal data assistant (paragraph [0056], Godlin).

Claims 21 and 27:

Regarding Claims 21 and 27, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin teaches wherein the remote client is a cellular phone (paragraph [0005], Godlin).

Claim 25:

Regarding Claim 25, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin teaches wherein copying the file to a remote location (paragraph [0147], wherein the client then reconstructs that latest version of the request filed in step 448, and the client applies the diff pairs to the cached version serially and updates the vnum to the latest version, which is interpreted to be equivalent to “copying the file to a remote location”, Godlin).

Claim 30:

Regarding Claim 30, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin teaches wherein the remote client is a laptop computer (REFER to claims 3 and 11, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Godlin).

Claim 31:

Regarding Claim 31, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin teaches wherein the remote client is a personal data assistant (REFER to claims 4 and 12, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Godlin).

Claim 32:

Regarding Claim 32, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin teaches wherein the remote client is a cellular phone (REFER to claims 5 and 13, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Godlin).

Claim 33:

Regarding Claim 33, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin discloses a message parser configured to:

accept an electronic mail message, the electronic mail message including a file attachment (Figure 7C, all features and column 44, lines 55-62, Zhang);
determine whether to remove the file attachment (column 16, lines 58-65, wherein to remove a resource the user chooses the internet, resources, and remove, selects a resource from a displayed list and clicks remove, Zhang);

in response to a positive determination, store the file attachment in an attachment location (Figure 12, wherein an attachment is stored, Zhang); and

insert a hyperlink associated with the attachment location (columns 11 and 12, lines 62-67 and lines 1-5, respectively, Zhang).

Claim 34:

Regarding Claim 34, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin teaches an attachment reference module configured to generate a link associated with the attachment location (columns 11-12, lines 63-67 and lines 1-10, wherein the user can click a message button to select a file containing a message, the user clicks attach URL, the address site of a world wide web, to add an internet address a part of the message information, wherein the user receiving the URL can click on it to launch their web browser and jump to the URL site, wherein the user can select a file to send as an attachment to the meeting invitation, wherein jump to the URL site is interpreted to be the link, Zhang).

Claim 36:

Regarding Claim 36, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin teaches wherein the remote client is a personal data assistant (REFER to claims 4, 12, and 20, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Godlin).

Claim 37:

Regarding Claim 37, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin teaches wherein the remote client is a data enabled cell phone (REFER to claims 5, 13, and 21, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Godlin).

Claim 38:

Regarding Claim 38, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin teaches wherein the remote client is a laptop computer (REFER to 3, 11, and 19, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Godlin).

Claim 39:

Regarding Claim 39, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin teaches wherein the remote client is a whiteboard device (column 9, lines 40-45, wherein the board room meeting, the board room resource is in effect invited to the meeting, wherein the SK calendar which is controlling the scheduling calendar for the board room, wherein the board room can reply, wherein this interpreted to be equivalent to a whiteboard device and column 9, lines 52-54, wherein the system provides a desk pad interface, that is a personal information management interface which includes an electronic appointment calendar, Zhang).

Claim 40:

Regarding Claim 40, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin teaches accepting a selection of a file from the unified list (column 17, lines 16-17, wherein the user selects the resource from the resource list, Zhang); and

routing the file to a connected service (column 17, lines 12-20, wherein transferring a resource is an act of assigning a resource the user owns to another manager, wherein the user selects the resource from resource list and then click on the transfer button, Zhang).

Claim 42:

Regarding Claim 42, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin discloses the above limitations. However, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin does not disclose wherein the service is a fax service configured to fax the file-to a remote recipient.

On the other hand, Lamming does disclose wherein the service is a fax service configured to fax the file-to a remote recipient (column 9, lines 43-49, wherein document A is initially scanned by the multifunction machine and its corresponding token is beamed by IR to Ann's Tab, and the relevant icon appears in her satchel and some time later when document A is not available, Ann beams the document token to multifunction fax machine 38, which automatically prints out document A, which is interpreted to be equivalent to "service is a fax service configured to fax the file-to a remote recipient", Lamming).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Lamming teachings into the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine as suggest by Lamming [see

abstract] for establishing easy remote access as well as implementing an improved method for transferring files between portable device using multi-function operations/capabilities.

Claim 44:

Regarding Claim 44, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin and further in view of Lamming teaches accepting a request to share an original version of the file on the unified list (Figure 7, diagrams 104 and 106 and further defined in column 10, lines 50-60, wherein the processor initiates the broadcast of the tab user's identity code to the environment, wherein this code may be encrypted using shared key and the Tab processor then advances to step 104. During step 104 the Tab processor checks for a legal (valid) user input, for example the user copying a document icon to another satchel, or other device, using the touch screen and If such a legal input is received, the Tab processor branches from step 104 to step 106. During step 106 the Tab processor directs the transmission of the selected document token by IR to the recipient, which is interpreted to be equivalent to "accepting a request to share an original version of the file on the unified list", Lamming); and accepting credentials configured to enable retrieval of the file from the file source (column 11, lines 6-24, respectively, Lamming).

Claim 45:

Regarding Claim 45, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin and further in view of Lamming teaches transmitting an email message to the remote user storing a reference to the file (column 17, lines 53-67, respectively, Zhang).

Claim 46:

Regarding Claim 46, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin and further in view of Lamming teaches wherein if the latest version is in the cache, the client utilize the version stored in the cache, and if there is a more recent version on the server the server sends and the client receives the difference between the last version and the version that the client has cached, Godlin); and

notifying an owner of the shared file that the shared file has been changed (paragraph [0173], Godlin).

Claim 48:

Regarding Claim 48, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin and further in view of Lamming teaches wherein the multiple locations include a file source belonging to a remote user and the list of recent files includes a file on the file source belonging to the remote user (paragraphs [0147] and [0150], Godlin).

Claim 49:

Regarding Claim 49 the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin and further in view of Lamming teaches wherein the action request comprises a request to share a copy of the file with a remote user (column 10, lines 36-42, respectively, Lamming).

Claim 51:

Regarding Claim 51, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin and further in view of Lamming teaches wherein the action request comprises a request to share an original version of the file with a remote user (columns 35-36, wherein the program code is defined and lines 69-70, wherein a reply includes the original message body including the section, Zhang).

Claim 55:

Regarding Claim 55, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin and further in view of Lamming teaches wherein the reference is configured to enable a remote user to access a copy of the file (paragraph [0158], wherein the client may receive a request to delete, rename, or replace an existing file, wherein the version is stored on the server DS20 copy, Godlin).

Claim 56:

Regarding Claim 56, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin and further in view of Lamming teaches wherein the reference is configured to enable a remote user to access an original version of the file (paragraph [0158], wherein the client creates a local copy of the existing file, which is interpreted to be the original version of the file, Godlin).

Claim 57:

Regarding Claim 57, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin and further in view of Lamming teaches wherein the remote client is a personal data assistant (REFER to claims 4, 12, and 20, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Godlin).

Claim 58:

Regarding Claim 58, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin and further in view of Lamming teaches wherein the remote client is a laptop computer (REFER to claims 3, 11, and 19, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Godlin).

Claim 59:

Regarding Claim 38, the combination of Zhang in view of Godlin and further in view of Lamming teaches wherein the remote client is a data enabled cell phone (REFER to claims 5, 13, 21, wherein this limitation is substantially the same/or similar and therefore rejected under the same grounds, Godlin).

Prior Art of Record

1. Laming et al (US Patent No. 6,144,997)
2. Zhang e t al. (US Patent No. 6,016,478)
3. Godlin et al (US Publication No. 20020161860)
4. Hilbert et al (US Publication No. 2003/0088570)

Point of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Helene Rose whose telephone number is (571) 272-0749. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am - 4:30pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HRR
Technology Center 2100
March 29, 2007


DON WONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100